

30th June, 1959.

COCOM Document No. 3582 B

COORDINATING COMMITTEE

RECORD OF DISCUSSION

ON

THE EXPORT OF CABLES TO THE U.S.S.R.

22nd June, 1959

Present: Belgium(Luxembourg), Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy,
Japan, Netherlands, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States.

References: COCOM Documents 3436 and Addendum, 3444, 3450, 3451, 3452, 3464, 3470
3472, 3473, 3474, 3475, 3483, 3487, 3415.26/1, 2 and 3, 3489, 3492,
3500, 3517.

1. The BELGIAN Delegate, referring to the French Delegate's statements concerning the export of 450 kms of cable to the Soviet Union (COCOM Doc. 3517) said he wished to inform the Committee without delay that his authorities reserved the right of decision in the event of a new export request being submitted to them. Furthermore, it would be difficult for the Belgian authorities to accept that, arguing from a Belgian action intended to re-establish the principle of equality of treatment between participating countries, the French authorities should authorise exports exceeding the 450 kms of cable which they intended to deliver to the U.S.S.R.
2. The FRENCH Delegate stated that although he had no desire to enter into controversy, he wished to point out that the Belgian authorities had informed the Committee in the course of the meeting held on the 16th April (COCOM 3492) that they would join in the view expressed by the majority that these cables were covered by Item 1526. If the Belgian authorities now authorised an export of these cables, their position would thus be essentially different from that of the French authorities who had granted a licence in the conviction that this material was covered by List IV; it was as a compromise that, while still believing that these cables were covered by Item 4481, the French authorities had undertaken not to authorise a fresh export as long as no new definition had been agreed unanimously in the Committee and if all Member Governments observed the same attitude.
3. The BELGIAN Delegate stated that, from the technical point of view, Belgian Government departments still considered that these cables were covered by Item 4481; the position his Delegation had taken at the previous meeting had been inspired by a concern for conciliation in order to induce the French authorities to renounce the proposed export.
4. The ITALIAN Delegate stated that this reappearance of the cable problem would certainly receive his authorities' attention. The Delegate had one question to put to his Belgian colleague at this point: were the Committee to understand that in the event of an export being carried out, the Belgian Government would inform the Committee by means of the monthly statistical returns, or immediately after issuance of the licence? Furthermore, could it be assumed that, in any event, the Belgian authorities would not authorise the export of a higher quantity than that for which the French authorities had granted a licence, namely 450 kms.?
5. The BELGIAN Delegate stated his personal belief that in such an event his Government would inform the Committee after issuing the licence; he undertook nevertheless to ask his authorities for confirmation on this point. In reply to

SECRET

- 2 -

COCOM Document No. 3582 B

his Italian colleague's second question, the Delegate stated that his Government did not propose to export more than 450 kms of cable, as the object of the Belgian Government's decision was to re-establish the principle of equality of treatment which had been threatened by the French decision.

6. The FRENCH Delegate stated that his authorities considered that they had made an adequate contribution towards restoring the principle of equality of treatment through the undertaking they had given as to the future; as the Delegate had just recalled (paragraph 2. above).

S E C R E T